

**REMARKS**

Claims 15-32 are presently pending in this application. Claims 15-19 have been canceled.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 15 and 17-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by unpatentable over Loewer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,788). Claims 15-19 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 19-32.

Contrary to the position of the examiner, Loewer et al. does not disclose use of the described disposable bib for "catching and retaining expelled solid particles and liquid droplets from a cough, sneeze or nose blow in the pouch enclosure." In fact, nothing in Loewer et al. fairly suggests the use of the disposable bib as a handkerchief for any purpose whatsoever. Accordingly, Loewer et al. does not anticipate claims 20-32, and the rejections of claims 20-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loewer et al. Claim 16 has now been canceled, making this rejection moot.

Applicant submits that no new rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be applied to claims 20-32 since there is nothing in Loewer et al. to suggest or offer incentive to those of ordinary skill in the art to make use of the disposable bib

disclosed in Loewer et al. for "catching and retaining expelled solid particles and liquid droplets from a cough, sneeze or nose blow in the pouch enclosure." Although, as pointed out by the examiner, it would be possible to fold the bib disclosed in Loewer et al. and use it as a handkerchief, there is nothing in Loewer et al. which fairly suggests doing so.

Similarly, none of the other references cited in this application suggest or offer incentive to those of ordinary skill in the art to employ a soft absorbent material-based device, with a pouch layer to catch and retain expelled solid particles and liquid droplets from a cough, sneeze or nose blow in the pouch enclosure.

Thus, none of the references cited in this application made the invention (as claimed in claims 20-32) obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and no rejections of claims 20-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 would be proper.

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth above, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration, reexamination and allowance of all claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON & MAK

Date: October 19, 2005

By: 

Danton K. Mak  
Reg. No. 31,695

225 S. Lake Ave., 9<sup>th</sup> Flr.  
Pasadena, CA 91101  
(626) 796-4000

I hereby certify that on October 19, 2005, I deposited with the U.S. Postal Service  
this package, addressed to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

  
Jennifer Anka